

Filed: February 2, 2017

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ACRUX DDS PTY LTD. & ACRUX LIMITED  
Petitioners,

v.

KAKEN PHARMACEUTICAL CO., LTD. and  
VALEANT PHARMACEUTICALS INTERNATIONAL, INC.  
Patent Owner and Licensee

---

Case: IPR2017-00190  
U.S. Patent No. 7,214,506

---

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND.....	7
A. Onychomycosis .....	7
B. Structure and Composition of Human Nail.....	7
C. Onychomycosis was Difficult to Treat .....	10
D. Topical Treatments for Onychomycosis Were Ineffective .....	11
E. The Invention .....	13
F. The '506 Patent .....	15
G. Jublia® .....	16
III. GROUNDS 1-3 SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE THE INVENTION WAS REDUCED TO PRACTICE BEFORE OGURA WAS ALLEGEDLY PUBLISHED .....	17
IV. THE PETITION DOES NOT MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR INSTITUTING <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW .....	20
A. All Grounds of the Petition Should Be Denied Because Petitioner Fails to Construe Critical Claim Terms.....	20
B. The Petition Fails to Show a Reasonable Likelihood that the Challenged Claims Are Unpatentable — Grounds 1-6.....	22
1. The Level of Skill in the Art.....	23
2. Treating Onychomycosis was Highly Unpredictable .....	24
3. The Petition Provides Insufficient Evidence to Explain Why a POSA Would Have Combined the Kaken Abstracts With Any of the Nail Lacquer/Solution References — Grounds 4-6.....	30

4.	The Petition Provides Insufficient Evidence to Explain Why a POSA Would Have Combined Ogura With Any of the Nail Lacquer References — Grounds 1-3 .....	43
V.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS SUPPORT THE NON-OBVIOUSNESS OF THE CLAIMS.....	48
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	49

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b><u>Cases</u></b>	
<i>Coal. for Affordable Drugs V LLC v. Hoffman-LaRoche Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01792, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B., Mar. 11, 2016).....	22
<i>Coal. for Affordable Drugs VI LLC v. Celgene Corp.</i> , IPR2015-001169, Paper 22 (P.T.A.B., Nov. 16, 2015).....	39
<i>Cooper v. Goldfarb</i> , 154 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	18
<i>In re Dow Chem. Co.</i> , 837 F.2d 469 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	42, 47
<i>Dr. Reddy’s Labs., Inc. v. Pozen Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00802, Paper 28 (P.T.A.B., Oct. 9, 2015).....	33
<i>Dynamic Drinkware LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00131, Paper 42 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 12, 2014).....	17, 19
<i>Endo Pharms, Inc. v. Depomed, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00652, Paper 68 (P.T.A.B., Sept. 16, 2015).....	43
<i>Jiawei Tech. (HK) Ltd. v. Richmond</i> , IPR2014-00938, Paper 20 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 16, 2014) .....	20
IPR2014-00938, Paper 27 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 13, 2015) .....	20
<i>KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	29, 48
<i>Loral Fairchild Corp. v. Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co., Inc.</i> , 266 F.3d 1362-63 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	19
<i>Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.</i> , 79 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	17, 19
<i>Minerva Surgical, Inc. v. Hologic, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00680, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B., Sept. 12, 2016).....	22

<i>Otsuka Pharm. Co., Ltd. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	46
<i>SAS Inst., Inc. v. Complement Soft, LLC.</i> , 825 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	21
<i>Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Contractors USA, Inc.</i> , 617 F.3d 1296 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	48
<i>Yamanouchi Pharm. Co. v. Danbury Pharmacal, Inc.</i> , 231 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	33
<i>Zetec, Inc. v. Westinghouse Electric Co.</i> , IPR2014-00384, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. July 23, 2014) .....	20
<b>Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	48
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3) .....	4, 20
35 U.S.C. § 313 .....	1
35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....	4, 20, 21, 24
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a) .....	45
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....	21
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.104(b)(3), (4) .....	4, 20
37 C.F.R. § 42.107 .....	1

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.